REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0036482 (Thieme). Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0198111 (Tomsic). Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thieme in view of either U.S. Pat. No. 5,935,911 (Yamada) or U.S. Pat. No. 5,043,320 (Meyer). Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomsic in view of either Yamada or Meyer. Claims 1-5 have been amended. Claim 8 has been added. Support for this claim can be found at least in Figures 1A and 2 of the present application. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application in light of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for acknowledging the Information Disclosure Statements submitted on October 14, 2004 and May 4, 2006. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner also acknowledge the Information Disclosure Statement and the Claim for Priority, both submitted on February 23, 2004. In addition, please indicate whether the drawings of the present application are accepted.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Thieme. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Among the limitations of the present claims, as amended, that are not taught or suggested by Thieme is "one or more longitudinal holes." The Office Action admits that Thieme fails to teach limitation of "one or more holes" on page 5. Since Thieme does not teach all the limitations of the present claims, Thieme does not anticipate the present claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tomsic. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Among the limitations of the present claims, as amended, that are not taught or suggested by Tomsic is "one or more longitudinal holes." The Office Action admits that Tomsic fails to teach limitation of "one or more holes" on page 6. Since Tomsic does not teach all the limitations of the present claims, Tomsic does not anticipate the present claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thieme in view of any one of Yamada or Meyer. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomsic in view of any one of Yamada or Meyer. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Among the limitations of the present claims, as amended, that are not taught or suggested by the prior art is "one or more longitudinal holes."

As discussed above, the Office Action admits that Thieme and Tosmic fail to teach the limitation of "one or more longitudinal holes." The Office Action attempts to cure the deficiencies in Thieme and Tosmic with Yamada or Meyer. However, Yamada and Meyer merely discloses that a plurality of holes on a surface of a metal wire are filled with superconducting particles. For example, Mayer discloses several groups of holes which are filled with superconductor powder. *See* Meyer, col. 3, ll. 49-63. These holes have "a reduction in cross section." *See id.* Similarly, Yamada discloses that "a hole is formed in a *portion* of a molded body." *See* Yamada, col. 3, ll. 56-64 (emphasis added). There is no teaching in Meyer or Yamada of single-core or multi-core wire members that are sheaved, coated with metal, and assembled into the longitudinal holes of the base metal.

In contrast to Yamada and Meyer, the presently claimed invention recites holes in a base metal member. *See* specification, p. 13, ll. 4-11. The holes are formed in the base metal member using either a gun drill method or a metallurgic technique. *See id.* The holes have a diameter that is constant throughout the longitudinal direction of the base metal member. In addition, a single-core or multi-core wire member is assembled into the longitudinal holes of the base metal member.

Since neither Yamada nor Meyer teach or suggest single-core or multi-core members assembled into "one or more longitudinal holes," as recited in the present independent and dependent claims, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Ian R. Blum
Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant